

No. 9/6/86-6Lab./7840.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of (i) The State Transport Controller, Haryana, Chandigarh. (ii) General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Rewari :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI A. S. CHALIA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 284 of 1985

between

SHRI RAN SINGH, WORKMAN, AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF (i) THE STATE
TRANSPORT CONTROLLER, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH (ii) GENERAL MANAGER,
HARYANA ROADWAYS, REWARI

Present :

None for the workman.

Shri R. S. Yadav, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference under section 10(i)(c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. 14 of 1947) as amended from time to time and latest by Act 49 of 1984 (hereinafter referred as the said Act) was made to this Court by the State of Haryana (Department of Labour),—*vide* its endorsement No. ID/GRG/20096—102, dated 2nd May, 1985, to adjudicate upon the dispute of service matter covered by Second Schedule under section 7 of the said Act, arisen between Shri Ran Singh, workman and the respondent-management of (i) The State Transport Controller, Haryana Chandigarh, (ii) General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Rewari. Accordingly, it has been registered as reference No. 9 of 1984.

2. Today is the last opportunity for the petitioner to lead his evidence but he himself has not turned up. The case has already adjourned for a number of times for his evidence. It means that there is no evidence of the workman and as such reference is answered against himself which stands dismissed in default.

Dated the 5th September, 1986.

A. S. CHALIA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 2206, dated the 12th September, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

A. S. CHALIA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court,
Faridabad.

No. 9/6/86-6Lab./7841.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Injecto Ltd., 2015, Mathura Road, Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI A. S. CHALIA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 61 of 1986

between

SHRI SUDESH KUMAR SAINI, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF
M/S INJECTO LTD., 20/5, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present:—

Workman in person with Shri Tarsem Singh.

Shri G. D. Maheshwari for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference under section 10(1)(c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. 14 of 1947), as amended from time to time and latest by Act No. 49 of 1984 (hereinafter referred as the said Act) was made to this Court by the State of Haryana (Department of Labour),—*vide* its endorsement No. ID/FD/160-85/52197-201, dated 24th December, 1986 to adjudicate upon the dispute of service matter covered by Second Schedule under section 7 of the said Act, arisen between Shri Sudesh Kumar Saini, workman and respondent-management of M/s Injecto Ltd.; 20/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad. Accordingly, it has been registered as reference No. 61 of 1986.

2. On notice the respondent has appeared and filed detailed written statement contesting the claim. Sudesh Kumar, workman then repeated his claim,—*vide* a rejoinder. My learned predecessor had framed material issues on 9th May, 1986. Since then evidence of the respondent is over and case is now fixed for 12th September, 1986 for the evidence of the workman.

3. At the request of the parties the file has been taken up today and their statements have also been recorded. It has been stated by the workman that since then he has received the amount of Rs 11,025 from the respondent towards full and final settlement of all his claims and on that account he has further stated not to pursue the matter and he would not be entitled to be reinstated and re-employed with the respondent. Since the matter has been settled by the parties, the reference is accordingly answered.

A. S. CHALIA,

Dated the 4th September, 1986.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 2209, dated the 12th September, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

A. S. CHALIA,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

No. 9/6/86-6Lab./7843.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Injecto Ltd., 20/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad:—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI A. S. CHALIA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 47 of 1986

between

SHRI MAHINDER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF
M/S. INJECTO LTD., 20/5, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present :

Workman with Shri Darshan Singh.

Shri Bhupinder Singh for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference under section 10(1)(c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. 14 of 1947) as amended from time to time and latest by Act No. 49 of 1984 (hereinafter referred as the said Act) was made to this Court by the State of Haryana (Department of Labour),—*vide* its endorsement No. ID/FD/162/85/52113-17, dated 24th December, 1986 to adjudicate upon the dispute of service matter covered by Second Scheme under section 7 of the said Act, arisen between Shri Mahinder Singh, workman and the respondent-management of M/s Injecto Ltd., 20/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad. Accordingly, it has been registered as reference No. 47 of 1986.

2. The case is fixed for 12th October, 1986 for the evidence of the respondent-management and the same has been taken up at the request of the parties. It has been stated by Shri Mahinder Singh, concerned workman that he has since received the amount of Rs. 3750 from the respondent as full and final settlement of all his claims. He will have no right of reinstatement/re-employment with the respondent. The award received from the Government is accordingly answered.

Dated the 9th September, 1986.

A. S. CHALIA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 2211, dated the 12th September, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

A. S. CHALIA,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

KULWANT SINGH,
Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour and Employment Department.

श्रम विभाग

आदेश

दिनांक 3 नवम्बर, 1986

सं० ओ०वि०/हिसार/98-86/41178—चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल की राय है कि (1) परिवहन आयुक्त, हरियाणा, (2) राज्य परिवहन, सिरसा, के श्रमिक श्री मीत सिंह लिपिक, पुत्र श्री प्यारे लाल, गांव व डा० वेदवाला, तह० व जि० सिरसा तथा उसके प्रबन्धकों के बीच इसमें इसके बाद लिखित मामले में कोई औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझते हैं;

इसलिये, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) द्वारा प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल इसके द्वारा सरकारी अधिसूचना सं. 9641-1-श्रम 78/32573, दिनांक 6 नवम्बर, 1970 के साथ गठित सरकारी अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, रोहतक को विवादग्रस्त या उससे सुसंगत या उससे सम्बन्धित नीचे लिखा मामला न्यायनिर्णय एवं पंचाट तीन मास में देने हेतु निर्दिष्ट करते हैं जो कि उक्त प्रबन्धकों तथा श्रमिक के बीच या तो विवादग्रस्त मामला है या उक्त विवाद से सुसंगत अथवा सम्बन्धित है :—

क्या श्री मीत सिंह की सेवाओं का समापन न्यायोचित तथा ठीक है ? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस राहत का हकदार है ?

सं० ओ०वि०/एफ०डी०/132-86/41263.—चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल की राय है कि में० हिन्दुस्तान बैंक लि०, फरीदाबाद, के श्रमिक श्री रतन सिंह, पुत्र श्री देवी सिंह, मकान, नं० 49 इन्द्रा कालोनी नजदीक बाई. एम.सी.ए. चौक, फरीदाबाद तथा उसके प्रबन्धकों के मध्य इसमें इसके बाद लिखित मामले में कोई औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और चूंकि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल विवाद को न्यायनिर्णय हेतु निर्दिष्ट करना वांछनीय समझते हैं;

इसलिए, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदान की गई शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हरियाणा के राज्यपाल इसके द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण हरियाणा, फरीदाबाद को नीचे निर्दिष्ट मामला जो कि उक्त प्रबन्धकों तथा श्रमिक के बीच या तो विवादग्रस्त मामला है अथवा विवाद से सुसंगत या संबंधित मामला है न्यायनिर्णय एवं पंचाट तीन मास में देने हेतु निर्दिष्ट करते हैं :—

क्या श्री रतन सिंह की सेवाओं का समापन न्यायोचित तथा ठीक है ? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस राहत का हकदार है ?